

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021

by John Gunn DipTP, DipDBE, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3274583

Flat A, 80 Elmar Road, Tottenham, London N15 5DJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Orr against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/0733, dated 28 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as Replacement of existing roof with Mansard roof to existing two storey building including 3no new dormer windows, raised brick wall and new mansard roof to existing two storey rear wing, at boundary with no 78: raised party wall and chimney stacks and at three sides of an external wall: raised parapet wall. All in materials and style to match existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021, the main parties have been given an opportunity to comment on its provisions in regard to the appeal. I have taken any responses into account and referred to the 2021 Framework in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a simple and traditional two storey end terrace dwelling on the corner of Elmar Road and Avenue Road. Whilst slightly taller, it is part of the street scene made up of buildings where consistent design detail, set back and roofscape contribute positively to a defined uniform character and appearance.
5. The addition of a mansard style roof and accompanying dormer to the building would be a stark contrast to the prevailing roofscape of the terrace. It would add uncharacteristic bulk and mass to the roof and would accordingly interrupt the pleasant homogeneity of the street scene. The visual effect of the change would be exacerbated by the prominent corner location of the appeal building. The appeal building is already taller than the rest of the terrace of which it is part. However, it retains traditional detailing, as well as the characteristic roof scale and fenestration style.

6. No 85 Elmar Road is also taller than its neighbours and incorporates some obviously different frontage design features to other properties in the road. I am not aware of the circumstances that prevailed at the time the property was built, or indeed altered, if it was. That said, I find that it is of a simple design that 'bookends' the terrace in a subtle manner and is thus complimentary to its surroundings. In a similar way to the appeal building. As such it does not justify allowing development the appeal scheme which would be noticeably more top heavy.
7. I would attach some weight to the appellant's desire to create additional accommodation to meet family needs. However, I remain to be convinced that the appeal scheme is the only way of achieving that. Against the substantial weight that I would ascribe to the harm and conflict with the development plan I have found, this would also therefore not be sufficient for me to allow the appeal.
8. The proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area in the terms I have described. This would be contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017. These policies require, amongst other things, that development should incorporate high quality design that enhances local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

9. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Gunn

INSPECTOR

